

Authors' response to reviewers' comments for Ms. No. 18684

Systematic analysis of the safety and benefits of transvaginal Hybrid-NOTES
cholecystectomy

Dear editor and reviewer,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise this manuscript and also for the very constructive suggestions, which we were happy to implement. A summary of the changes follows:

Comments To Authors:

Congratulations to the authors on a very good paper on this relatively new topic. I think this paper is for the most part all written, with good information. There are certainly limitations to the database data for example, but this is addressed in the manuscript. One main problem I had was that this is really several different studies combined into one paper. I found it difficult to follow. Perhaps because the methods were each listed, and then the results. I found myself losing track of which study was done with which methods. I'm not sure the main editors would prefer this another way though: either as separate papers, or by separating each component of the study. Meaning to put the methods and then the results of each sub-component before proceeding to the next one. Maybe that seems a little strange going back from results to methods, but I think it might be easier for the reader to keep track.

Response:

Thank you very much for your kind review. The manuscript deals with an analysis of a new operative technique by a review of five consecutive studies and the discussion about these results in the context and with the existing literature. So I changed the order of the methods and results of each study, whereby it is not necessary to go back from results to methods.

Furthermore (according to the editors' comments in 18684-edited.doc):

The manuscript was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one or more of the highly qualified native English speaking editors at American Journal Experts (please see the Editorial Certificate).

The title was changed (shortened).

We added a running title.

We corrected the author names-style.

We added the “author contributions” and “conflict-of-interest”.

We changed the “Correspondence to” style.

We changed the abstract according to your guidelines.

We added a core tip to the manuscript.

We added an audio core tip file (.mp3).

We changed the reference numbers style according to your guidelines, also in table 1.

We added “COMMENTS” (Background, Research frontiers etc.) at the end of the manuscript.

We changed the reference list according to your guidelines.

I hope that this addresses all comments to your satisfaction.

Yours sincerely

Dirk R. Bulian